

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—We shall rise for lunch at 1 O' Clock and re-assemble at 20' Clock.

---

### MYSORE ANIMAL DISEASES (CONTROL) BILL, 1959.

#### *Motion to consider.*

**Sri N. RACHIAH** (Minister for Agriculture).—I beg to move,

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration”

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—Motion moved :

“That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

†**Sri N. RACHIAH.**—Sir, this is a very simple Bill and at the same time it is a very important Bill as Government contemplate to protect the livestock wealth in the State from all sorts of diseases, both contagious and infectious. Our country being primarily an agricultural country, livestock wealth of the State and the country plays a very important role in our food production and the production of wealth.

12-30 P. M.

So the Government desire to see this Bill becoming law. There are different enactments prevailing in the different areas of the state in regard to the prevention of diseases. This Bill has already been moved and passed in the Legislative Council and I now commend it for the kind consideration of this House.

During the third plan period the Government would give the topmost priority for the improvement of livestock because animal husbandry plays a very important role. With the increase in population of our state in particular and no country in general, we have step up food production. People are taking to non-vegetarian food more and more it is imperative that we protect animal wealth in order to make the diet wholesome. Moreover we are in dire need of large quantities of milk for consumption of our people, particularly children. All this means that we have to protect animal wealth with great care and responsibility.

Our farmers have generally been representing that their animals like cattle and sheep are not well-protected and timely help is not given with regard to the dispensation of medicines and other amenities. Therefore there is urgent and absolute necessity to see that this Bill is passed. Therefore I now request the House to give its consideration to this bill, which I consider is very important, though simple.

† **Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—Sir, while speaking on this Bill I wish the Hon'ble Minister had spent a little more time in explaining a few relevant facts concerned with some of the provisions of this Bill. In the Statement of objects and Reasons it is stated that different enactments

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

are in force in the integrating areas and as such it is sought to introduce uniform and integrated legislation applicable to the entire Mysore State. It is quite a long time—nearly 4½ years. We have been accusing Government of making inordinate delay in the matter of introducing uniformity in legislation in respect of various matters. I do not know how many other Bills of this kind are still pending but in any case in a way I am happy that this Bill atleast has come to the forefront. I agree with the Hon'ble Minister that it is a very important bill, though a simple one. There seems to be an awareness on the part of the Government now, at the beginning of the third plan, that the cattle wealth of the State has got to be zealously guarded and improved. The Hon'ble Minister would have done well if he had only referred to the Quinquennial Census of Agricultural livestock. I do not know when it was taken and whether the system is still in force and what exactly is being done about it. The Minister has agreed and admitted that the cattle wealth is the mainstay of agriculturists and if agricultural production has got to be improved the ryot has got to be assured that his cattle would be safe and free from diseases.

This Bill refers to the different enactments in force in the several integrating areas. I wish the Hon'ble Minister had drawn our attention to the essential points of difference between the acts in the several integrating areas and the erstwhile Mysore State. I wonder whether this Bill is an improvement on the other Bills either individually or collectively; if it is an improvement, to what extent and in what respects. Such information would have been valuable for us to discuss this Bill in detail. This Bill notably makes an omission in regard to the mentioning of the Government's duties and responsibilities in the matter of control of diseases, in regard to the preventive measures apart from the curative measures they are suggesting. What are the provision for controlling Gomals and village pasteurs which are fertile sources for spreading infection diseases. There seems to be no mention about this at all in this Bill.

I shall now refer to the details one by one. In sub-clause (3) of clause 1, it is stated that the act shall come into force at once in the areas in which the enactments repealed by section 38 are in force; and shall come into force in any other area on such date as the State Government may, by notification specify. As to why this was found necessary we find no explanation.

In regard to the definitions in clause 2, I wish the Hon'ble Minister had avoided the word "swine" which has got a bad connotation in the English language. If you call a pig a pig it is correct but to call a pig a swine is not good. It is not a happy word. Even now if the Hon'ble Minister agrees, it is better that this word is omitted.

In regard to the definition of contagious and infectious diseases, it is a highly technical matter and I am sure that the Hon'ble Minister would agree that the definition clause is not exhaustive by any means and this

is perhaps the reason why he takes cloak under "such other diseases as may be notified...". We are aware that the majority of our ryot population is uneducated or I may call them 'illiterate' by and large. How are they to know, when it is notified in the gazette or at some place, that a particular disease is infectious. They are the people who suffer under the penalty clause. I am afraid that unless a clarification is issued from time to time and published in the vernacular language in the rural areas, the ryots are liable to be hauled up under the penal provisions of this Bill.

In clause 5 in regard to the 'power to inoculate and regulate movement of animals and to control the holding of markets, fair, etc., and traffic infective in animals', I want to know whether the word "may" can be substituted by word "shall". It should not be optional but compulsory.

Under sub-clause 1 (a) of clause 6, the local officer is given too much of a discretion, perhaps to the detriment of the affected ryot. Unless certain areas are specified as segregation areas to serve the needs of 10 or 15 villages, the problem would be difficult. Suppose an officer makes village A as a place of segregation. The obligation is cast on the affected ryot to see that the infected cattle are conveyed to that particular place. Unless these areas of segregation are made more effective, the ryot is likely to suffer the order passed would be ineffective because of his inability to transport the cattle to places 10 miles away. It is the villagers and the other cattle that would suffer. This segregation order would have to be made a little more effective than what is provided for in the Bill at present.

In regard to sub clause (5) (b) of clause 6, I think the owner of the cattle is entitled to be told that such an order is going to be passed. Supposing the Veterinary Inspector or the Veterinary Officer take it into his head that it is a very difficult case, instead of going through the process of curing it, he may say that the animal may be destroyed. He will have to give the reason and convince the poor ryot. It is better that in its own interest the animal is destroyed. For example, in the Race Course, if a horse becomes lame, with the consent of the owner we destroy it because it is no longer fit for any work. Therefore, before the Inspector orders the destroyal of a particular infected animal, it is better that he records his reasons therefor and convinces the poor ryot. Of course, the ryot will not ordinarily be convinced. Even if such a provision is made, it will minimise the chances of indiscriminate destroyal. I do not mean to suggest that the officers are inhuman. Wherever there is a difficult case, he may consider that it is much better that he gets rid of it.

In regard to the declaration of private infected places and examination of such places by a Veterinary Officer, you are making a distinction between an area occupied by a local authority or railway administration and a private infected place. In one case, you want

(**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA**)

the Veterinary Inspector to be the entire boss of the show and he can take any action he likes but in the case of a local authority or railway administration, you have made some special provision and you are putting a senior officer. I want to know why any distinction should be made in the method of assessing a particular place as being infected between a local authority or railway administration and a private building. I should like to have a clarification from the Hon'ble Minister whether there is any special reason for this.

**Sri N. RACHIAH.**—We have contacted the Central Government and they have said that it would be better to provide for an officer with an higher rank in the case of a local authority and railway administration.

**Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.**—If this kind of distinction is made, I am afraid it will naturally provoke a lot of heart-burning. Suppose it is a big landlord or a zamindar. The stakes so far as he is concerned are just as great as those of any local authority or railway administration. So, is there any special reason for providing for a different procedure for dealing with private infected places? After all, the private place is situated within the limits or jurisdiction of a municipality or local authority. So, why a separate procedure is necessary in their case?

Then, in sub-clause (3) it is provided that 'the Veterinary Officer shall forthwith report the action taken by him under this sub-section to the prescribed authority.' I do not know why this authority is not mentioned in the Act itself. It is very necessary that this authority is defined in the statute itself. Otherwise, it may be the Deputy Commissioner in one case, the Divisional Commissioner in a second case and the Government in a third case. Where is the difficulty in mentioning to whom this report has got to be made? There is another case in which the ryot has got to make a report to the Veterinary Inspector. The officer may be in district headquarter or taluk headquarter and the infections disease may occur in a village 50 miles away from the taluka headquarter. With the introduction of the Village panchayats and Taluka Boards, why don't you provide for a report being made to the Village Panchayat which will take further steps by reporting it to the Veterinary Officer? Why do you make the ryot responsible for it and make him run to the Taluka headquarter or District Headquarter? I think that kind of relief is necessary. That report which the ryot is expected to make to the Veterinary Officer should be made to the Village Panchayat and the Village Panchayat should with all speed take steps to report the matter to the Veterinary Inspector or the Veterinary Officer, as the case may be.

Again, in sub-section (4) of section 7, you say that 'if the Veterinary Officer cancels the order passed by the Inspector,..... I presume that he functioning in an appellate capacity. He is passing an order on the report of the Inspector. The section does not say on what grounds cancel the order. Provision should be made for this; otherwise, he may pass any whimsical order and it may be to the detriment of the ryot.'

Coming to section 10, it is with reference to this section that I said earlier that you have made no provision for dealing with gomals and pasture lands and to protect them against contamination or infection. You have only referred to 'produce of and animal, or any food, bedding or other things used in connection with the animal'. After all, the gomals and grazing grounds are the most fruitful source of infection and it is that you have to guard against. But there is no provision in this Bill for taking any steps to prevent that kind of infection spreading. So, you must also bring gomals and grazing lands also within the purview of thi clause.

Then, section 16 deals with the duty of certain persons to report contagious or infectious diseases. I have already spoken about the ryot's responsibility in this matter. It is sufficient if he gives a report to the Village Panchayat. You have also made the Veterinary Practitioner to report these matters. How does a Veterinary Practitioner become liable to make a report to Veterinary Inspector? Is it his fault that he treats an animal or gives it first aid? I would not have mentioned it but for the fact that you have provided for punishment in the penal clause for failure to report. If a ryot fails to make a report, he comes within the purview of the law and can be punished. But why do you want to involve a Veterinary Practitioner? If he does not report he gets a fine a Rs. 100. It is not correct. No Veterinary Practitioner will come forward to treat the cattle in those circumstances.

#### Clause 18- Powers of entry and inspection.

"Subject to such rules as may be prescribed, any Inspector or Veterinary Officer may enter upon and inspect any land or building or other place,....."

In this clause unlimited powers are given whereas under clause 6, the powers given are limited. Supposing there is an infection in a place served by the railways or local authority. The officer has to write to the railways, who in turn will have to write to the General Manager and give permission to the Veterinary Officer to inspect and take suitable measure. In this process there is bound to be lot of delay and any infection or disease c nnot wait. So, you must see that there is no contradiction between two sections.

In regaard to penal clauses, I am afraid the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture whom I thought was sympathetic to the ryots would not have imposed such punishment in the Bill. If one reads the Bill it will be seen that for almost every failure to comply with any provision of the Bill, there is heavy fine and imprisonment. For example, it is said.

"Whoever fails to render every facility and assistance to a Veterinary Officer as required by section 12"

The section 12 states.

"In any area or place declared to be an infected area or place under this Act, the Veterinary Officer or Inspector duly

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

authorised by the Veterinary Officer in this behalf, shall, in all cases in which preventive vaccination or inoculation is possible and practicable, vaccinate or inoculate, as the case may be, such kinds or classes of animals in the area or place as may be prescribed and the owner or person in charge or having control of every such animal, shall render every facility or assistance to the Veterinary Officer or Inspector in carrying out such vaccination or inoculation."

Nowhere it is said what facility should be provided to vaccinate. Supposing a person temporarily leaves a few herds of cattle and is away from headquarters, under this Bill he is expected to give every facility. Failure to do so, he will be liable for punishment. There does not seem to be any distinction in regard to the nature of offence and every kind of act is brought under this penal clause. This will result in the harassment of people.

So far as clause 17 is concerned, the responsibility for segregating the infective animals, is not all right. It has to be that of the Government the Veterinary Inspector. You must allow a separate place for segregation.

Sri N. RACHIAH—Now the situation has changed. We will request the Village Panchayats to set apart a place. While framing rules under this Act, we will provide for all that.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Comming to sub-clause (k) of clause 22 I have already said that the limit of Rs. 500 should be lowered.

Clause 24 says:—

"Whoever brings or attempts to bring to a market, fair, exhibition or other concentration of animals, any animal which he knows or has reason to believe to be infective, shall be punished..."

How are you going to impart knowledge to the ryot as to whether an animal is suffering from infective disease? Many of the officer of the department themselves do not know from what disease an animal is suffering. So, in such cases if you impose penalty, the whole Bill will act as a harassment to the ryot. The diseases are so complicated and a ryot does not know the complexity of diseases.

Clause 23 seems to be very much against the interests of the ryots. Similarly clause 24. So far as cattles are concerned, I know that no ryot would ever take a cattle which is infective nor would remove the cattle out of the village. But if he has no knowledge of the disease and brings it to market, he would be hauled up. Such a provision would only discourage the people from participating in cattle fairs etc. This clause requires revision.

Clause 25 provides for imprisonment. I should presume that it is neither simple or rigorous. Is it your intention that a person who has violated the provisions of this Bill should undergo rigorous imprisonment as if he has committed a heinous crime? I know that damage caused due to the negligence is enormous. But is he to be imprisoned for that?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and meet after one hour.

---

*The House adjourned for recess at One of the Clock and re assembled at Two of the Clock.*

---

[Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I was dealing with clause 25 in which I was asking whether the imprisonment referred to was either simple or rigorous. I understand from the Hon'ble Minister that where no mention is made, it generally means simple imprisonment. I do not how, I am open to correction. I think in such cases the discretion is left to the magistrate concerned. What I am inclined to urge on this occasion is that it should not be a case of rigorous imprisonment.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I agree with you. Generally the magistrate will take a dispassionate view and pass judgement.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That a man should be condemned it rigorous imprisonment for any offence under this section, I do not know how far it is fair.

Coming to section 28 Sir, here is the case of an officer who acts in good faith and this section provides for convicting him and punishing him with imprisonment. I says.—

“28: *Penalty for vexatious entry, inspection or seizure.*—(1) Whoever, being an Inspector of a Veterinary Officer, appointed under this Act, vexatiously and unnecessarily enters or inspects any land, building or other place or any vessel or vehicle or seizes or detains any animal, shall, on conviction, be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees or with both.”

Please read clause 34 (2) :

“No officer or servant of State Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceeding if the act was done in good faith in the course of the execution of his duties, or the discharge of functions imposed by or under this Act.”

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

I consider that there is a gross conflict between the two provisions Clause 28 which provides for penalty for vexatious action, and clause 34 (2) which is intended to give protection to any officer who acts in good faith. Supposing a very bad type of raiyat who has got a grouse against the veterinary officer for discharging his normal duties, he wants to put up a case against him. You are completely exposing him to the risk of being punished by a court.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—But only if he enters the place.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—He is not interested in going to a place where the cattle are not affected by any disease. In one section you give protection under 34 and in another section namely clause 28, you actually make a provision for punishing him. It is a question of opinion. I do not think if any other legislation this kind of a provision for giving up an officer is provided for I do not know if you have got to revise this. Please think it over. Supposing a group of raiyats who do not like an officer may put him before a court. It depends on the nature of evidence. But suppose half a dozen people join together and create trouble. In that case, an officer would go into any house.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That has to be proved to the satisfaction of the court.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—But just think what would be the reaction that is produced in any officer.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If it is a harassment to the raiyat concerned, should there not be a measure of protection to the raiyat? Possibly, this is the only Bill which providing some protection to the person concerned.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What I say is, under clause 34 protection is given to an officer, but under clause 28, it hands over the person to the court. At that rate, it becomes very difficult for any person to work with any interest or zeal. It is not a matter of pleasure for him to go into the house another person and give a declaration that the place is infected or give an order in respect of diseased cattle there. But the man is going to be hauled up before a court. You know it is very difficult to prove vexatious acts. Harassment is still there. But the officer has got to keep on going to court and it interferes with his normal business.

Clause 31 says: "No magistrate shall take cognisance of an offence under this Act, except upon the complaint or report of a Veterinary Officer." It looks as if the Law Department has not looked into the incongruity. What about clause 28? The man concerned is a Veterinary Officer. Clause 31 of the Act provides for a Magistrate taking cognisance of no offence except under the report of a Veterinary

Officer. Clause 28 contemplates, it is the veterinary officer who is complained against. That means, the magistrate cannot take cognisance of it. How are you going to explain this incongruity?

These are certain general observations which I wish to make in connection with the Bill itself. There are one or two other observations which I would like to make in this connection. This Bill completes the void in regard to the responsibility of the Government to prevent the spread of disease. You say, you are doing preventive inoculation. What other preventive measures you are going to take it is mentioned nowherein the Bill. It is all penalising the raiyat from top to bottom. A Government which swears on the welfare of the raiyat, makes a chapter like chapter IV—clauses 29 to 36. It hardly shows any indication of the interest of the Government in the raiyat. I am sorry to say that.

However, I would like to know what happened to the Bill of 1948 in regard to the castration of scrub Bills which was in operation in Mysore State. It was one of those negative measures taken by the then Government of Mysore to improve the breed of cattle. The first step adopted to improve the breed of cattle was to get rid of undesirable ones. I want to know whether that Bill is still in operation.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is before the other House.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to one other matter; you have referred to this danger about the mosquito bite. I am aware in certain villages mosquitos which bite cattle, come and bite people also and some of the doctors said it leads to a very gruesome disease. They have not yet been able to diagnose the disease which comes as a result of the mosquito biting a human being which has in the first instance bitten cattle. I want to know if there is anything done, to show whether the Department has designed any virus to see that this kind of disease does not spread to the human beings.

I am not aware of any such thing. When the mosquito first bites the cattle and then the human being—I understand that it is a very deadly thing.

Then, Sir, in regard to the Serum Institute, I know that the Serum Institute in Mysore, is doing actually good work. But we have not seen in the departmental reports of the Veterinary Department what progress the Institute has made in doing some useful work by way of scientific and biological research. When Government is so solicitous in regard to the welfare of the rural folk, I want to know what positive measures have been undertaken during the first and Second Five-Year plans to improve the breed of cattle. You know what these cattle fairs are doing. I am afraid I do not want to be very critical. Beyond giving occasions for Ministers to visit, I would like to ask whether the cattle fairs have been of any great help in improving the breed of cows. Is there any cattle fair where twenty heads of cows are exhibited? Even in a place

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

like Subramanya Ghati, where forty to fifty thousand heads of cattle are exhibited, you cannot have fifty heads of cows. You were pleased to make on observation that you are anxious to see that the supply of milk throughout the State is increased and that the breed of cows is improved. But I see no positive measures pursued either in the first, second or third plans. It is one of the standing complaints against Government that they do not do anything positive. You have brought this measure. I would only say that the measure has been brought as if you want to penalise the people. It is no doubt a very laudable enterprise to arrest the spread of the disease. It is alright. But you do not make any positive measure. This Bill is purely one-sided. It is as if you want to punish the people, and beyond that there is nothing either in regard to the improvement of cattle wealth or to improve the breed of cattle and things of that kind. So far as the new preparation of serum and drugs are concerned, I want to know what the Serum Institute is doing. It is not within the easy reach of the ryot so far as these preventive measures are concerned. If the villager goes to the Veterinary Officer and places before him the spread of the disease in his area, he will say that he is busy in the other area. The existing Act is not functioning satisfactorily. Except that you want to punish the people, there is nothing positive. This is my one standing grievance.

In regard to the registering of cattle in each village—you refer to the Bill—I want to know (this is the basis for the preparation of the quinquennial census of agricultural stock) on whom does this responsibility of maintaining the registers will fall now. Will it be transferred to the Village Panchayat or to whom else? You are now abolishing the Village Patels and Shanbhogues. Then necessarily it has to be maintained by the Village Panchayat. The maintenance of registers, the responsibility for even reporting the death and birth of cattle will have to lay with the Village Panchayat itself. Just as you maintain the register of births and deaths of human beings, it is very necessary for the Village Panchayats to maintain registers for the progress made in improving cattle wealth.

I wish to make another suggestion in regard to the maintenance of Veterinary Hospitals. Mysore took pride, in the erstwhile Mysore State before integration, that Mysore was the one State, where for a determined number of cattle, the number of hospitals was the highest. I do not know if the position continues to be the same today.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—We have reached the figure of 27,000 for one hospital.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That means, a lot of leeway has to be covered. In regard to the provision of hospitals—Veterinary Dispensaries and Hospitals, you ought to agitate. The unit must be the taluk, but the hospital must be centrally located.

Take a taluk like Shimoga. If you have it at the taluk headquarters in Shimoga taluk, there are villages at a distance of about 45 miles from taluk headquarters and the hospital or dispensary at taluk headquarters will not serve the needs of the village. You locate the hospital...

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Where there is a concentration of cattle wealth !

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I agree. If you are going to locate the dispensary or the hospital where there is concentration of cattle wealth, nobody can have a grievance. Merely to give the taluk headquarters all importance, you cannot locate the hospitals there.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH.—Even in certain Hobli headquarters there are veterinary hospitals—in old Mysore.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to the provision of trained personnel, salastries, I do not know if you have prescribed any Course. If these people have got to be in charge of enforcement of the provisions of this particular Bill, unless you train them, I think you are doing a positive injustice to the entire ryot community. I want to know what arrangements have been made to have trained personnel for various hospitals. In this matter we are very much behind the schedule.

Then, Sir while talking about gomal lands, it is said that the spread of the disease is only from the gomal lands and pastures. But the Government either in the Agricultural Department or the Revenue Department have done precious little. The gomal lands are the worst maintained. They are arid and unhealthy. It is laid down in the revenue law that for every 100 heads of cattle, 30 acres of gomal land would be provided. But in the majority of the villages, these thirty acres of land are taken away and given for cultivation. Even the few acres of land that remain is unhealthy and filthy and even you cannot have access to this area. Unless you make those gomal lands fertile, which are now being neglected, unless positive measures are taken, you cannot prevent sources of infection from spreading to the cattle from these so called gomal lands and pastures. Most of the cattle stray to these gomal lands, which are not healthy. They will catch the infection. Unless you make provision for village gomal lands, there is no possibility of giving any relief to the ryot.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Farmers' Forum are willing to raise pastures on these gomal lands if the Government are willing. What are your views ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I do not know why the Farmers' Forum should take this work. In every village, the raising of the pastures in gomal is the responsibility of the Village Panchayat. The Village Panchayat should take the responsibility for its gomal land. If you want to inculcate ideas of self-Government, you must go the whole hog. I do not know why you should not give the responsibility of maintaining the gomal lands and raising pastures therein to the village panchayat. Do you mean to say that the village panchayat cannot manage its gomal.

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

Well let farmers' forums be formed in the village panchayat itself. Let that be a centre for disseminating knowledge for the farmers in the village. I am against any outside agency. If you like the Farmers' Forum may open a branch in every village, in every hobli and in every taluk headquarters. But I am not for any interference. Who will have more interest in the gomai land than the villagers of the village themselves, especially when it is in the interests of the village cattle?

In the third plan, simultaneously with the passing of the Bill in spite of the criticism some of us make, you must take positive measures to improve the cattle. Otherwise Government will expose themselves to the criticism that they have neglected making provisions for the improvement of agricultural production ; and the ryot who is getting five acres, *per capita* distribution of land, does not have a pair of bullocks and a cow, I am afraid, no agricultural production will take place.

With these remarks, I close my observation. I would like the Hon'ble Minister to remove some of the clauses which are calculated positively to harass the ryots I am rather surprised that the Agricultural Minister, who is known to have sympathy with the ryot, should have piloted this Bill. I am equally sorry that it has strengthened his hand by the Legislative Council passing it. I do not wish to pass any observations except to say that the rigour of the penal clauses should be removed as far as possible.

2-30 P.M.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I shall make only a few observations in support of what Mr. Malleradhyha already said.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I forgot to say this. Section 30 where a police officer can arrest everybody and anybody for any offence under this section without even a warrant is one of these very objectionable clauses which should be removed from this Bill.

"Any police officer not below the rank of a sub-Inspector may, at the request in writing of a Veterinary Officer, arrest without warrant any person who has been concerned in any offence under this Act."

However laudable your intentions might be, I am sorry to say I cannot associate myself with such an omnibus provision in a Bill of this kind dealing with ryots to allow a police officer to arrest anybody without a warrant. Is it a cognizable offence ? Supposing I fail to report the occurrence of infectious disease in respect of some cattle. Any blooming sub-Inspector can come and arrest me without a warrant. This is one of these sections with reference to which I am very much perturbed. Supposing the man comes and arrests a ryot. Then all undesirable methods have to be resorted to extricate himself from the clutches of the law. The police officer may be honest ; but look at the

amount of harassment caused to the ryot if he fails to make a report either by oversight or by some mistake. Is he to be arrested and produced before a Magistrate and then he is to offer bail. Such a state of affairs is some thinkable. That is why I say that some of the provisions are fantastic. Whatever provisions are objectionable, you must yourselves move for their deletion.

**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.**—I fully endorse the observations made by Mr. Mallaradhy and I shall be very brief since he has already covered most of the grounds pertaining to this Bill. Of course, the object of the Bill is said to be 'control of animal diseases.' This question of control of animal diseases has to be approached from a fundamental angle and also from a social angle. That particular aspect has not been kept in mind either by the Government or the framers of this Bill. what I say is, such a communicable disease such as is mentioned in section 2 (b). cannot be tackled in an individualistic manner making the ryot responsible, but it should be tackled by the department. But I am saying that in the context of the immensity of the problem the resources that are placed at the disposal of the veterinary officers, whether in terms of qualified persons or administrative set up are certainly inadequate. After all, this is not a new Bill. A similar Bill has been in force for a considerable number of years. Even as it is, we have not been able to tackle the problem. That means, it is *prima facie* clear that the problem is quite large and such a problem should not be tackled on an individualistic basis. The Government or the framers of the Bill have not given adequate attention to this aspect. I am having in view the question of cattle insurance. We see to-day that is the trend. The other day we have seen that the State employees Insurance Corporation has been entrusted with the task of fighting diseases and giving adequate protection to workers suffering from various diseases. The central idea behind all that is that such communicable diseases or such preventive measures can best be tackled in an overall manner and not merely in the manner set out in the Bill. Cattle insurance is a most important thing. If that principle is accepted, the responsibility is distributed throughout the society in an equitable way, whereas here as pointed out by Mr. Mallaradhy, a person who either through ignorance or due to economic difficulties is not able to provide sufficient medicine or is not able to provide all arrangements to prevent the eruption of disease, is made responsible and you penalise him for an act of ignorance or an act of indifference. Even incometax legislation and other legislation the penal clauses are not so severe as is contemplated in a measure which is supposed to have social objects. This is something which is extraordinary. You can look to any of the other legislations—income-tax-legislation, sales tax legislation: even there there are certain measures which seem to indicate that consideration is shown to the person who comes within the ambit of the law. For example, here a veterinary officer can enter any building. In income-tax legislation, one can enter the building only before sunset. At least such consideration is

(Sri M. C. NABASIMHAN)

shown even in the case of a sales tax assessee who is expected to pay something to the State, but here that is not the position. How is it that such elementary things did not strike the Government who is supposed to strive for the welfare of the nation. What was the hurry in getting the Bill and spending some time of the House. There are already seven laws in force. Is there. Is there any difficulty experienced in the administration of law. Is it anticipated that there is such a break out of these diseases in the near future as to compel the Government to think it necessary to bring a Bill of this kind and take some time of the House. Are there not Bills which are more urgent in character either of social type or taxation ; why is it that those things are not brought.

Endorsing the suggestions made by Mr. Mallaradhy, I would like to point out those things omitted by him. Section 3(2) refers to a person duly qualified in veterinary medicine. If he passes compounders' test, does he become duly qualified officer ? Nowhere is it said what exactly is to be a duly qualified officer. This would naturally lead to litigation and confusion. I do not see any reason why this elementary thing was omitted by the Government.

Under section 6, the intention appears to be to subject the owner to unnecessary harassment. Under section 6(1) (b), the owner's responsibility is to subject the particular cattle to such treatment as may be specified in the order. I do not know if it is envisaged that the Government will meet the cost of any particular treatment. May be, they will supply serum or certain medicine : but the entire treatment as envisaged in the order of the veterinary officer may not mean only this. When there is a communicable disease, when you say it is a dangerous disease, it is the duty of the Government to do everything in power not merely to eradicate it but to see that means are provided for owners to help to eradicate the disease. It should not be left purely to the individual's capacity or means to provide all these medicines or all other treatment that the veterinary officer deems necessary. It is the duty of the Government to provide all the necessary means to give this treatment.

Sir, 6 (b) is important from another point of view. Supposing, a person is not in a position economically to give this treatment to the cattle immediately; immediately he comes within the mischief of the Act and the penal clause can be taken advantage of by the Veterinary Officer or the officer who enforces this law.

Then, Sir, I am not able to understand the real purport or the real purpose of the clause 6 (5) (b) and 6 (5) (c). If the Veterinary Officer certifies that animal is affected with infectious disease, the Inspector shall destroy the animal. It may be possible to cure the animal either by segregation or some other treatment. Supposing, in a particular place, a Veterinary Officer feels he is not able to provide the animal with adequate treatment; then, very easily, he may say that it may be destroyed. The moment the animal catches infectious disease, the

whole thing passes from the purview of the owner to the Inspector and he will be the deciding factor. Supposing the owner is prepared to give the treatment required but the officer is not able to provide with that treatment, or that medicine. What should happen? I do not think that such a clause could ever be permitted in any act.

Sir, regarding the power of entry, I am afraid, it is far beyond what is required or what is justified in terms of the object which this statute seeks to sub-serve. Why should such a power of entering any place at any time be given? The officer need not even bother of the privacy of the person concerned. This is an extra-ordinary clause. I am not saying that the Veterinary Officers would always abuse the power. But such action by him is possible. The framers of the Bill themselves have envisaged such a situation. Normally, it is for us to say that such a clause should have been there in Acts like Sales-tax etc. I am really surprised that very little relief is provided for a situation where the Veterinary Officer might have to be prosecuted for such an entry. What that is the position, why should you provide clause 18?

Coming to clause 27, the defence of the Government may be that they must trust the Veterinary Officer and Law Officer to implement the act honestly. We shall take it for whatever it is worth. But, should they not, in turn, expect the raiyat also to act in some honest why? If he does not do it, it may be due to ignorance and sheer economic difficulty. After all, ignorance could not be cured by legislation. So, I cannot understand for such a severe clause like 27 where a person who sells an animal which he knows is suffering from infectious disease is subjected to prosecution. Supposing he does know it and he sells; there is nothing wrong. I do not understand how the object of the Bill is defeated. Only thing is, he may try to get away with some money which he has invested on the animal. He may be penalised for not reporting the matter to the Veterinary Officer. But, if he sells and somebody is prepared to buy, what is wrong? You may say, he is cheating the other person. After all, there are several other transactions like this which are not taken cognisance of at all. I do not see any reason why such a clause should be there. Regarding clause 30, it is only during war time that there was some restriction on the movement of cattle from district to district. But, now I do not think there is any such restriction. If that is there, all the normal rights would also be interfered and it would mean un-necessary harrassment. I know there is a protection that it is a person not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector that that arrest without warrant. I am afraid whether he would have sufficient time to look into such things.

Sir, with these words I close my observations.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ತಾಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬ).—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ, ದನ, ಕರ, ಕುರಿಮರ, ಹಂಡಿ, ನಾಯಿ, ಆಸಾಂಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಲಾಧಾತ್ತವಾದ ಖಾದನಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ಪರಕಾರದವರು “The Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959” ಎನ್ನು ವಿಭಿನ್ನನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅಗಾಗಲೇ ಇರು ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್

(ಶ. ಸ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ತಾರ್ಥಿ)

ಇತ್ತಾದ್ಯಿ ಕಾಮುರೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳನ್ನು ಡಾಕ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗ್ನವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾಕು. ಕೂದರೆ ಜನ ಏನಾದರೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ರೈನ್‌ನೇನ್‌ನ ಅಪ್ಪಣಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವಸ್ತು ಈಗ ಇದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇಲ್ಲಾ ಮುಂತಿಗಳೂ, ಅದಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ಅರಿತಿ ದಾಷ್ಟಾರೆ. ಅನ್ನರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇವರಿಂದ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಇನ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ತೂಡೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸೋಡೆ ಬೇಕು. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಡಾಕ್ಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳು ಕೆಲವೇಳೆ ಜೋಳದ ಸಿಪ್ಪೆ ತಿಂದು ನತ್ತು ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಈಗ ಪೆಟರಿನಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ಇಡಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್‌ಹೋರ್ನ್‌ಗಿಂತಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಕಾಮುರೆ ಬಂದಂಥ ದನವನ್ನು ಡಾಕ್ಟೆಗೆ ತಿಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ ನಂದು ಅತನ್ನು ಪ್ರೇಲ್ಬ್ರೇಚ್‌ಗೆ ನಡೆ ಎಂದು ಕರೆದು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ; ನಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದನಗಳು ಉರಿನ ಸುತ್ತಲೂ ಇರುತ್ತಕ್ಕ ಜೋಳದ ತಿಂದು ನೆಗೆಯುತ್ತಾ ನೆಗೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಮಾರ್ಟ್‌ ಬಿಡು ಸೂಕ್ತತ್ವ, ಬೀಳುವುದು ಸ್ವಾಫ್ಬಾಹಿಕ. ಅದರ್ಪಿನ ಪಟ್ಟೆಲಿನಗೇನ್‌ನಾದರೂ ಹೋರಿ ನಾಕರು ವಷಣ ವೇರೆ ದ್ವೇಷವಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಪ್ತೇಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ಕೂಟ್ಯಾ ಅವನನ್ನು ಪುನರಾಯಿಸಿ ಹೋರಿಸಿಕಾರುವವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಸಲ್ಲದ ಹಿಂಸೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳು ಬೇಕಾದಪ್ಪಿವೆ. ಏಪ್ರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಬಾರಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹಾಪೆಕೆಳಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಿರೆ. ಅದರೆ ದೇಶದ್ವಿರುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ರಂಗೋಲಿ ತಳಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸ್ವರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಹೊದಲನೆಯುದಾಗಿ ಅದರ ಘೋಯೋದ್ದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ತಳದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮ್ಮುಳ್ಳಿಸಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ದುರುಪಯೋಗವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾರೂ ಪಾಕಿಸ್ತಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಿಂದ ಬಂದವರಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶಾಭಿಮಾನದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರೈತರಾ, ಬಡಬನ್ನು ಏನಾದರೂ ತಪ್ಪಿವಾದಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವೇತ್ತಿ ಬಗೇರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ದ ಪ್ರಿಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆವಿರಬೇಕೇ ಹೀತು ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ದ್ವೇಷಣ್ಣನ್ನು ಅವರಮೇಲೆ ಇಳಿಷ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೀಸಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಟ್ಯಾ ಬಹಳಾಗಿ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸುಷಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇಕೆಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಇರುವಾದರು. ಆಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸುದೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಅಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವೇಳಿತರಾದ ವಿಶೇಷದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾಮುಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀಮಾತ್ ಸರಸಿಹಂ ಅರರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಯಾರೂ ಏಂದು ಹೇಳಿಬಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕಾದ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಚಾರ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಂ ಚಾರ್ಕೆ ನಂತಹ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ಗಾತ್ರತ್ವ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರೆದೆಂಬ ದುಸ್ಹಿಭಾವವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇಟ್ಟು ಕೂಡಬೇಕು ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ನಾನೂ ಸರ್ವಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಡುವುದು ಎಂಬುದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸರ್ಕಾರದದ್ವಾರಾ ಏಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಜನಕೆಗೆ ಹಿಂಸೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮುನ್ಯೆಲ್ಲ ಬೇರೆ 80 ವರ್ಷದ ವಯಸ್ಸಿನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಅತನ ಕಡೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಕಾಗ್ಗಿದೆ ಈ ಹೋರಿಯನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸಾಗಿಸಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಪಡೆಬೇಕಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ಅತಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾಗೆ ತಡ್ಡದೆ. ಅನ್ನರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ತೋಂದರೆಯಾಗುವರು ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅಲೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಜನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಒಳೆಯಿದಾಗಬೇಕು. ಜನತೆಯ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಈ ದೇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬರೆಕ್ಕೆಂದ್ರ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಂಬಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರೂಗೆ ಅಳವಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲವು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸ. ಜಿ. ಮಂತ್ರಾಲಯ)

ಜ್ಞಾನಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುದರೆಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಇವರು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತಿಗ್ರಹಣ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದ್ದಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಬಹುತೇಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಕರವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಯಾವನಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಳಿನ ದನ, ಹಂದಿ, ಕುರಿ, ಮುಕ್ಕೆ, ಸಾಯಿ, ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜ್ಞಾನದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಭಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ತಿದಿಯ ಕೊಂಡುಕಾಕಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆನ್ನು ಕಾಮುಕೆ ಎಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಎಂಬ ಮಾಡಿರೆ ಅಗ ಆ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕಿದವನು ರೋಗದ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾನೆಂದು ಅರ್ಥನ್ನು ತಿಳಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಹೀಗೆ ಆ ಉರಿಸಲ್ಪಟಿ ಲವಣೆಗೆ ಅಗದೇ ಇರುವ ಚಂದನ ಮೇಲೆ ಸುಮೃದ್ಧಿ ಸುಮೃದ್ಧಿ ಬೆಂಕ ಹಜ್ಜುವುದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಡೆಯುತ್ತಕ್ಕ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗಿನ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ಅಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದರದರೆ ಕೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅವರ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ್ಲಾ ನಾಯಾಯವಾಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವರು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳೂ ನಾಯಾಯವಾದ ತತ್ವವಿಷಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಬರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಶತಮಾನ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಿಂದ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ದಿನಾಂಕಿಸಿದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕಾಯದೆ, ಕಟ್ಟಣಿ ಸಿಹಿ ಮಾಡಲ್ಪಟಿ ನಿಷ್ಳಿರಂದಾಗಬೇಕು. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಂತಹ ಭವಣಿಯನ್ನು ಡಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಿದೆ. ಅದರೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ನವ್ಯ ಹಿಂಣಿನಾಯಕರಾದೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಏರಿನಾಗಾದರು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮೆರಿನಿರ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಹೊಳಿಬಿತ ತಾಳುಕ್ಕಾನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ದಾಖಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರು. ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊಡ್ಡಿ ಹೊಡ್ಡಿ ಅನುಕ್ರಮತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹ್ಯಾಗ್ನಿಫ್ಲೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಿರ್ಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಸಂಘತನೆ, ಪ್ರಾಣಿ ಸುಖತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ನೀಡುತ್ತಿಂದಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಅಷ್ಟು ಕಾಯಲೀಗಳನ್ನು ರೋಗಿಗೆ ಹಿಂಣಿ ದೂರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನೌದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ನರ ಯಾಳಿ. ಸರ್ಪ್ರೋಕ್ ಮ್ಯಾಕ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ವೆಚ್ಚಿನಿರ ಆಫಿಸರುಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಜಿಪ್ಪಿದಿ ಹೊದರ್ತೇ ಇರುವೆಂದ್ಲೂ ಇಂತಹದನ್ನಿಂತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಹೊಳಿಬಿತ, ಹೆಚ್‌ಕ್ರೋಟರ್‌ರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ದನಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಾಯಲೇ ಒಂದರೆ ಆ ಕಾಯಲೀಯನ್ನು ದೂರ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿರು ಯಾವರಿತಿ ಏಫಾರ್ಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದುದಿನ ಒಂದು ಉರಿಸಲ್ಪಟಿ ನಿರ್ತುಹೋಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಾಕಿಸುವ ಅ ವಿಷಯದನ್ನು ಹತ್ತಿರದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಬೋಲ್ಲೆನ್ಸ್ ನಬ್ಬಿಷ್ಟ್‌ಕ್ರೂರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಎಂಬ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ಎಂಬ ಮಾಡಬೇದ್ದರೆ ಅವನು ತತ್ವ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೊನ್ನು ಅವನನ್ನು ಅರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ವೈಲ್ಲೆನ್ಸ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರೆಚ್‌ನ್ನಿಗೆ ನಡೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತಾನೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪನ್ನೆನ್ನು ಇನಾಹುತ್ತಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಅಂಬಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ನಿರ್ಕಾರದ ಯಾವುದು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬಹಳ ಉದಾತ್ಮಕ ದ್ವೇಷ್ಯಾವಸ್ಥೆ ಮತ್ತು ಒಹಕ ವಿಶಾಲ ಮಾನೌಭಾವ ಇರುವ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾತ್ರಿಗಳು ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಾಯಲೀಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಸಿಸಿವಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನೌದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಟ್ಟಾನ್ನಿಂದ ಜನತೆಗೆ ನರಭಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಆ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಸರಳವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮರಣಿಗೆ ತರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾನೌದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳವಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದರವರು ನುಡಿಫಾರ್ಮಾಫಾರಿ ಅರೆಂಬಿಜನೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ఇన్నీందు ఎచ్చము. సకారదివరు ఆ వునుచేప్పారుతప్ప, కానుగోగును, కొత్తపాదాగా ఎప్పు, జణబుకాగుత్తప్ప, ఉచ్చు, జనతికాలుగాళు బ్రీకాగాటుకుటు అంచించును ఇచ్చర్లు కేళిటిల్ల. పుచ్చునే పెటరిని ఇంపుక్కర్లు పెటరిని అభీన్వతించు కొత్తకేళితూరే. ఒంచోందు తాట్లుకంగా బింబిట్టి పెటరిని ఇంపుక్కర్లు ఇరిత్తు. ఉండోందు దిస్కుక్కుగే అందురీచున్నది ఇరియేకండు కేళిదార్లే ఆశాదరింగా గురు ఇర్చియొందను, తేగెదుకొందరే ఎప్పు జన పెటరిని ఇంపుక్కరుగాళు, ఏప్పు జన పెటరిని అభీసుగాళు ఇంద్రార్ల ఎంటును, సకారదివరు అంతాకే వాచబేకు. ఆ జందభద్రుల్ల పెటరిని అభీసరిగా మాత్రు పెటరిని ఇంపుక్కర్లగు ఇరువ కాప్పించిప్పేడా ఇన్నెబుందను. సకారదివరు ఏమీలే పూర్ణదేకు. యావుదారం ఒ ఒందు రిప్పీలైఫ్ ఇవర క్షేగే నీళ్ళదరే నాకు అడు ప్రేర్లనర క్రుగుగా కొనగే కోగ్గిబేరాగు క్రుదే. అచ్చర్లు నాకచ్చుక్కుగేజీచేడో రాయ్కో ఇరితక్క అభిసరుగాళు ఇల్లదే ఇరువుదింద అధరిగే ఖున్నా పచురు ఇల్లవేదు కేళ్ళు కేస్త్రుగే ప్రతింందోదే కానమినును స్కూపిసి చూచబేకాగుత్తదే అంధాద్యర్లు ఆ కానమినగానును ఎఫ్స్కుగే కేషిప్పర జనతిగే ఇంబు కొందరియాగుత్తదెబును, సకార యోచించబేకు. పెటరిని అభీసుగాగాలే అథవా పెటరిని ఇంపుక్కుగిగాగలే ఇరితక్క స్టేప్సో ఇను, అను సింహాగి గేజీచేడో అథవా నాన్నాగేజీచేడో ఎంబుందను దేశించన చూచబేకు. యాక్సందరే పడ్డిలనాగాలే, శాస్త్రము చోగ్గసాగాలే తాట్లుకాచో బోయ్కో వేంబరాగప్పి, అథవా అసెంబ్లీ వేంబర్లే ఆగాలే అధరమీలే ఆ గ్రాం, కంప్లెక్షన్ వాడుకుచు. అద్దరూద సకారదివు ఆ వునుచేప్పార్లు అడగిరక్క సత్కార సత్కార నున్న చేనాంగి ఏమిల్ఫ మాపబేకు. ఇల్లదిద్దరే ఆ కానుంచ ప్రకార అధికార ఇల్లరు అధికారిగాఁ కేసేర్లిం డడపరిగే ఎంబు తింందరియాగుత్తదెబు ఇను, సకార సుధిభువాగి యోళనే వాడబేకు. ఇంబు దోష్ట అధికార అధరిగే ఇరిబారదు ఎందు నాను కేళుత్తేనే. ఆ మసూదెయి ఛ్యేయ ధోరణిగాను ఆగా గరేన్నను కేలువు మాన్య స్టేపిటరు కేళిధాడ్దరే.

ಇನ್ನು ಹೆನಾಲ್ಪ್ ಕಾಣಿಕೆನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಅಫ್ನನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಪನಿಟ್ ಪೀಟ್‌ನ್ನು. ಈ ಮಂಜೂರಿಯಲ್ಲಿನ ಕೆಲವು ಕಾಣಿಸುಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾಯಿಶಾಸ್ತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾರಂಗತ್ಯಾದವರು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಉರಿಸಿ ಕೆಡುತ್ತಿರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಟರ್ಸ್‌ನಾಡ.—ಅಂತಹಗಳು ಕೋಡಿಗೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅಪ್ಪೊಡ್‌ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮೊಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

**3-00 P. M.**

ତାପ୍ତ ଏ ଫେରାଟ୍ କାହିଁନାହିଁ ଅଂଦର କାହାଦୋ 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 ମୁଢ଼ୁ  
ଧିପରୀଗୁ ଏ ଏଲ୍‌ଲେ କାହାଦୁଗପ୍ରମାଣିତ ରେଖିରୁଥିଲାନ୍ତି ନୋଇଦର ପକାରିଦିପାଙ୍ଗେ ଅଂଦର  
ରା କେତ୍କିପାଇଯେଇ ନାହିଁରକ୍ତ ଅଧିକାରିଗଲାଗେ ଆରୋ-ପକ୍ଷୀତାଗଲାଗୁ ଆ ଅଧିକାରୀ ପାଇଁ ୧୦

(ಶ್ರೀ ನಿ. ಜೀ. ಮುಕುಂದಪ್ಪ)

ಗಳಿಗೂ ತಲೇಲು ವಿನಾಯಕ್ ಬುವ್ವಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಡು ಬೇವಿವಾಸ್ತೋರ್ ಅಥವಾ ಬುದ್ದಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಬರೆದಿವಾದ್ದರೊ್ಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇಳಿದರೆ “ನಾವು ಎನ್ನಾ ಕಾನಾನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಗಣನ್ನು ಒದಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು” ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವಧಾ ಒದಿರುವದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮ ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಬಂದಾದರೆ ಅಗನುಷುಂದು ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಹನಿಃ ಅದೇ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದಾದರೆ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದೂ ಅಗನುವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟೆರಿಯಿಟ್ಟನಲ್ಲಿ ದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ್ಡ ಜಡ್ಟ್, ಮುನ್ಸೀಫ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಹಿರ್ ಜಡ್ಟ್ ರಾಗಣಕ್ಕುಂಥ ಜನಗೆಲ್ಲ ಇದ್ದಾಗೂ ಅಂಥವರು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕಾನಾನು ತಮಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾದ್ದರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಅದಕ್ವಾಡಿರತಕ್ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿವೆಯೇ ಇಂಥಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬಾದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಂಬುತ್ತಿನಿಂದ ವಾದಾವಢಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಇಗಾದು ದಕ್ಕು ತಾನೇ ಈ ಜನರು ತಯಾರಿಸಿದ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಾನಾನುಗಳು ಇದೇ ನ ಮ್ಯಾ ಹೇಗುಸಾರು ಹೈಕೇಳೋಫ್ ನ ಮುಂದೆ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳೂ ಒದಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ಒದಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ, ಈ ತಾನಾವರೂ ಸಂಸ್ಯಾರೂ ಒದಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿರೂ ಒದಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ. ಅದರೆ ಈಗ ಈಕಾರದವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ. Penalty for keeping or grazing infective animals in unenclosed land ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ಕರನ್ನರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ನಾರಕ್ಕಿಷ್ಟಿದೆ? ನಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾರಾವಾ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಗುಸಾರು ಗೆಂಟ್ಸ್ಟ್ ನನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಮೂರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರೆದುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದು ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವ ಬಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಆತ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ವಿನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ignorance of Law is no excuse ಎಂತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿಯದು ತಾರೆ. ಅಗ ಆ ಅನ್ನಕ್ಕರನ್ನಾದ ರೈತ್ತಿನ ಗತಿ ಏನಾಗಬೇಕು? ರೈತುಗಳ ರಾಜ್ಯಸಂಗೀರಿಷನೆ ವಾದತಕ್ಕ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನಾನು ಬಾರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬಾದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲು ನಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಒಂದು ಗೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸೀರೆ ಏನು ಏಷಾದು ಮಾಡಿದಾದ್ದರೆ? ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳಾದರೂ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಟ್ಲಾಗಳಿಗೆ ತಾವು ನೈನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ಎಂತ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಟ್ಲನ್ನು ತಮಾರಿಸ ತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳು ಆತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಗೋ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹೈಕೇಳೋ ಹೈಕೇಳೋ ಹೈಕೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಮ್ಮ ಯಾವಣ್ಣೆ ಕಾವಿದ್ದು ಅಂಥಾ ಹೇಳಿಯಲ್ಲೇ ಇಂಥಾ ಬಿಟ್ಲನ್ನು ಅದರ ಮುಂದಿದುತ್ತಾದ್ದರೆ. ಅಗ ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳು ಅ ಬಿಟ್ಲನ್ನೇಲೀಸಿದೆ ಎಂಬಾದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಸೊಂದಿದೆ ಆ ಬಿಟ್ಲಗೆ “B.D.J.” ಎಂತ ಸೈನ್ಯ ಡಾಡಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾದ್ದರೆ. ಒಂದುಕೇಳಿ ಅದರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೇನಾಬರೂ ಇಂಥಾ ಅನಾಹುತ ಈ ಬಿಟ್ಲನ್ನಿಂದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಅವರು “ಅಯ್ಯೋ ನೈನು ಗತಿ ಮಾಗಿತ್ತು. ನಾನು ಆ ಡೆಪ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೈಗೋ ಅತುರದಿಲ್ಲ ನಾನು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೈನ್ಯ ಡಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟೆ. ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಬಿಟ್ಲ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಮೈ ಕಾಣಿಬಿನಿಟ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ಬಿಬೆಕೆಂತ್” ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾದ್ದರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಗಳು ಅನೇಕಾವರ್ತೀ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಗಳು ನಡೆದು ಅನೇಕ ಹೇಳಿ ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳು ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ 20 ಜನರಿದ್ದಾದ್ದರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಬಂದಾಗ ಅವರು ಏನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಾರಿ ಈ ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳ್ಲಿ ಆಗಂಧಧ ಬಾಗಿಲು ಹಿಂದೆ ಕುಳಿತು ತರೆಂಬ ಬಡೆಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್‌ತಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಉತ್ತಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವೆನು ಯಾವಿಯಾಪುದೋ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಮತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರ್ಭೂತಾ? ಬಿರ್ ಹೇಳೆ ವಾತನಾಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ನಿ. ಜೀ. ಮುಕುಂದಪ್ಪ.—ಸಾರೀಗ ಮಾತನಾದುತ್ತಿರುವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಟ್ಲನ ಮೇರೀ ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದಾವತೀ ಶ್ರೀಮಾತ ಶಿವಾರ್ಥಿ ರಾಸೀಗಳು ಆ ಗಂಥಮಾರದ ಬಾಗಿಂಷ್ಟ್ರೆರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಣಿಬಿನಿಟ್ ರಾಯಿಗೆ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದುದು ಜಾತಿತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಂತು. ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ನಚಿನ ರಾಗಳ ನಿಂದ ನಡೆಯಾತಕ್ಕ ಆ ಸಚಿವಾಲಯವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಆ ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳ ಗುಂಪಿನ್ನು ಬುದ್ದಿವಂತರಾದ ಮುಂತ್ತಿ ಮುಂತ್ತಿಗಳು ರೈತರ ಹಿತಾರಕ್ಕಾಣಿಲ್ಲ ಅಸಹಿಯಾಗಬಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದು ಸಹ ರೈತರಿಗೆ

ಅಗ್ರಹಿ ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂತೆ ಅಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಬಜಾಪುರ ಹೀಗೆ ಬರಾಗಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಸರಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಅ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತ ಜನರ್ಷಿ ಹೆಸರಾಗಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಂಥಾ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಿಂದ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರಾವ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಫಲರೂ ಈ ತೊಂದರೆ ಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ Penalty for bringing infected animal to market" ಅಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ಯಾರೇ ಬ್ಯಾಬು ಬಂದು ದಿವಸ ನುಗೆ ಈ ತನ ಒಂದು ರಾಸನ್ನು ಹೊಮೆಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ದಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕುಂದುರೋಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಅತ ಅ ಕೂಡರೇ ದಾಕ್ರಿಗೆ ತೊರಿಸುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಅಗ ಡಾಕ್ಟರಾದವನು ಅದು ಈಂದು ರೋಗವಲ್ಲ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅಗ ಆ ರಾಸನ್ನು ಅತ ಸುಗೆಗೆ ತಂದರೆ ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಿಕ್ಸ್‌ಡಿಯು ಯಾರು? ಹೀಗೆ ಹೊನ್ನೆ ತಾನೆ ಆ ಗುಣ ತಾಫ್‌ಫಾಕಿನ್ನು ದಸಕ್ಕೆ ಲೋಗ ಬಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಅನ್ತರ್ಗೀ ತೆಗೆಯಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೊಳೆದಾಗ ಆ ರಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬುದಿದ್ದ ಲೋಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚೆ ಲೋಗ ಅಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರ್ ಅದನ್ನು ಹಂಡಿ ಲೋಗ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದರೂತಿ. ಇಂಥಾ ನುದಭಾಗಳ್ಲಿ ಆ ಜ್ಯೋಕ್‌ರೂ ಏನು ಕ್ರಮ ಕ್ರಿಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ವಾಸ್ತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಗೆಂದು ಇರುವಾಗ ನಕಾರದವರು ಆ ದಡ್‌ಜನರ ಮೇಲೆ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಾಗುವ ಶಾಸನಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದು. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ Penalty for placing Carcass of infected animal in river ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ನನ್ನ ಬಂದು ಹಂಸನ್ನು ಯಾರೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಿಗೆ ನಿಂದ ದಿವಸ ಹೊಡಿದು ಕೊಂಡುಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆ ಏಚಾರ ನನಗೆ 4-6 ದಿನಗಾರಿರೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ದಿನಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ನುಕರ ಅ ಬಾಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದಿಕಂಬೋಽದ್ ಅದಮೇಲೆ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳು ಈ ಹಂಗಿನೇರೋ ಬಾಯಿರೆ ಆಗಿತ್ತು, ಅದಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಇವನ್ನು ಹೀಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ ಕೊಡುಹಾಕಿದಾಗೆ ರೆಂತ ಹೇಳಿಬ್ಲಿಫ್ ಆಗ ನನ್ನ ಗತಯೊನಾಗ ಬೇಕು? ಹೀಗೆನ್ನಾ ನುದಭಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರೈತನು ರೈತನೆ ಬೇಕು. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕ್ರಿಗೆ ದಡ್‌ಜನನ್ನು ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಶಿಶ್ಯರ್ಥಿ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಸಹಿತ ಬಂದರೆ ಇದೆಂದ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಭಾರಿ ಪಟ್ಟದೆ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಈ ಏಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಬಾಯನ ಮಾಡಿರೂ ನಕಾರದವನು ತಮ್ಮ ವಾದಪ್ಪೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಕೋಳಿಗೆ "ನಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಮೂರು ಕಾಲವೇ" ಎಂತ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಕಾರದವರು ವಾವಿನುಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೋಗ ಬೇಡಿ ಎತ್ತ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಹೇಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಕಾರದವರು ಕಾಲಂಕಂಪಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಹಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಿ ನೋಡಿ. ಹಂಸಣಿರೆನಾಯಿದಂತೆ ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಜಿನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಬಿಡಿ. ಹೀಗೇ ಈ "Penalty for sale or transfer of infective animals" ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ಬಂದು ವೇರೆ ನನ್ನ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ರೈತಭಾಂದವ ಸಂಸಾರಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವರೇ ಬಂದು ವೇರೆ ಅವರ ನಂಬಿಂದಿರುತ್ತಾ ಮನಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದಾಗ್ಗ ಅವಾ ಗಾಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಎತ್ತಿಗೆ ಲೋಗ ಬಂದ ರೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ? ಇಲ್ಲಿ Penalty for sale or transfer ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಿದಾರೆ. ಆಗ ಅವರು ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಭ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದಸಹಿಗೆ ಲೋಗ ಬಂದುಬಯತ್ತ. ಆ ಏಚಾರ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗೆದ್ದರೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೀದಿ ಬರುತ್ತೆ. ಮಾರಿಬುಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆ ಎತ್ತನ್ನು ಯಾರೇ ಬ್ಯಾಬು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ನುದಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಲೋಗದ ಎತ್ತನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡವಿಗೆ ಶ್ವಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ-ಮಾರಿದವರಿಗೆ ಶ್ವಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ-ಯಾರೇ ಹೇಳಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದು ಮನಗೆ ಹೇಗೆನ್ನುತ್ತಾರೆ-ದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇ. ಆ ಹೇಳಿನ್ನು ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಲಗ್ಗುವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಕೆಳ್ಳಿಗೆ ಇಂಥಾ ಲೋಗವಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಆ ಹೇಳಿನ್ನು ಕ್ರಿಬಿದುಹುದು. ಹಾಗೇ ಎತ್ತನ್ನು ನಕಿಂಬಿತ್ತ ಇಂಥಾ ಲೋಗವಿದೆ ಎಂತ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇ ಕ್ರಿಬಿದಿಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆನ್ನಾ ನಾನಾ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ನಕಾರದವರು ಭಾವಾಲನ ಕುತ್ತಿರ್ದೇವನ

(క్రేస్. పి. మంగళు, ఎమ్)

ಇವನಾಡಲು ಪ್ರೇತನ ಹಾಗೂ ಗೋವಾಲನ ತರೀಕೆಳಪ್ಪಣಿ ಎಂತ ಹೇಳಾತ್ಮದ್ವೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು  
Penalty for vexatious entry, etc. ಬಿಕಾರದ್ವಾ ಆಗಾಗೇ ತ್ರೇ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಷಪ್ಪಾ  
ಉತ್ತರವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ತ್ರೇ ಎಂ. ನರಸಿಕನ್ನರವರೂ ವಿವರವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದ್ದೂರಿದ  
ಅಂಶಪ್ಪಾ ಬಿಕಾರಗೆ ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರಾರ್ಥಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವರ ಸುಧಿಫ್ರವಾಗಿ ಅಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ಅ  
ಂಶಪ್ಪಾ ಕಾಳಿಪ್ಪಾಗನ್ನು ಕಾಳಿರುವದರ ಪರಿಣಾಮವಿಂದ ಬಿಸಾಗುತ್ತಿರದರೆ ಈ ದನ, ಕೂರಿ.  
ಕೊಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಕ ಕ್ರಿಂದಿಗೂಳಿಯಿದ್ದು ಆ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾವೇಕೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗ  
ಬೆಳೆಕೆಂದು ಇವಾಗೆನನ್ನು ನಾಕು ವುದನ್ನೇ ಕೈಬಿಡತಕ್ಕ ಹಂಸಿತಿ ಬಂತ್ತೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಶ್ರೀದೇವಾಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕ್ಯಾನಿಂದ ನಾವರು ದನ ಕುರಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಾಕಾರೆಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಜನರು  
ಖ್ಯಾತಾರ್ಥಿಗಳಾಗಿರದೆ ಗುಂಡುಗೋವಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಾಳಲು ಈ ಬಿಂಬಿ ಉತ್ತೇಜನೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಹಾಗಿದೆ.  
ಅತ್ಯರೂಣ ನಾನಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾಳಿಪ್ಪಾಗಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿರುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕೆ ತೀವ್ರತೆಯಿನಿಂದಿರ್ಯಾಗಿ  
ಉಂಟನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಪ್ರೇರಿಸಿರಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಿಕಾರ ಕೊಣಕ್ಕೆ  
ಹೇಳಿರೆ ಕ್ರಿಬೀಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಪಾರ್ಬಲ್ಯ ಯಥಾ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗಲೂ  
ಇದೆ. ಈ ಇಂಬಿ ತ್ರೀ ಬಿ.ಡಿ. ಜಿತ್ತಿಯಾರ ಕೈಲುಲದ್ದರೆ ತಾನೇ ಸನ್ನ? ನಾಳಿ ಅವರು ಈ ಸೈಕ್ಕಿಗೆ  
ಬುಂದು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಆಗ ಇದರ ಪ್ರಭಾವ ಅವರಿಗೂ ತಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ವಾರಂತೆ  
ಹೆಡೀಡಿದ್ದಾನೂ ಹೆಡೀಡಿದ್ದು ದೂರ ಬಂದು ಅವರು ಯಾರಾದೂ ಅಗಿಲಿಲ ಅವರನ್ನು ಅರೆನ್ನು ಮಾಡೇ  
ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹುದೆ ನರ್ವ್ ಮಿಜ್, ಬಿವಾಕ್ ಮಾಡಬಾವ್, ನರ್ ಅಕಾರಾಟರು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ  
ಇತ್ತಾಗು ಹೆಗೆ ಪ್ರೇರಿಸಿರು ಅರೆನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಹೌಗೆ ಅಗುಗೆ ಅಗುಲೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.  
ಈ ಕಾಲದ್ವಾ ಆಗ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನಿರುವ ಜನನು ಹಿಂದಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರೇರಿಸಿರನ್ನು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ  
ಘಾರಾಂತರಿಂದು ಬೆಳೆದ್ದ, ಅದರಿಂದ ಬೆಳೆದ್ದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅರೆನ್ನು ಬಂದೇ ಏಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತಾರೆ  
ಬಿಂಬಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅರಾಜಕೆ ತರೆಯಿತ್ತು ಮರಿಯುತ್ತಿದೆ ಏಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಆ ಗಾಂವಿ ಭಕ್ತರು ಈಗ  
ಹೇಳಿತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಪ್ರಭಾಕರಭಾತ್ಯ ಅದಿಕಾರ ಮನ್ನು ಬಾಳಸದೆ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕರನ್ನು ಸೀದಾ ಪ್ರೇರಿಸಿರು ಹೆಗೆ  
ಕೊಣಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನ್ನಾಮಿ, ಈ ರಿಂತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗೆ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ  
ಇಲ್ಲಾಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಬಿಂಬಿಲಾವಣಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅತಿವಿನ್ಯಾಸಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ  
ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತಾನೆ. With all seriousness I am putting before the House.  
I am appealing to the Government.

ಅದಕ್ಕೊಸ್ತರ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವದೆನ್ನೇದರೆ ಈನ್‌ಡಿ ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಕೋಟಿ<sup>1</sup> ರೂಪೀ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್‌ಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕಿರವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮಾನ ಮಾರ್ಗದೆಗೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನ ಅವಾದನೆ ಹೊಂತತಾರ್‌ರ ಎಬುಬುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೌಲ್ಯನ್‌ರೂಪೀ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಇಚ್ಛು, ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬ್ರಿಡ, ಯಾಕಂದರೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ರಿಲ್ಯಾಂಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷಾದುತ್ತಾರೆ. ದಸ್ತಗಿರಿ ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ II class magistrate ವಾರಂತೆ ಇರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನೂತ್ನ ಅದ್ದುಪಡಿವಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಕಾನ್ವೆನಿನ್‌ನ್ನ ಶಾಸನದ ಕಿತ್ತತಕ್ಕ ಹಿನಂಬಿತ್ತದೆ. ಇದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕಾನ್ವೆನ್‌ನನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್‌ಕ್ಕೆ ಅನೇಕ ನ್ಯಾನ್‌ಸೆಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಡಿಲೆಟ್‌ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಲ ವಿನಿಯುದಿಂದ ಬಾಗ್ರಥ್ಯನ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲ್ಲಿತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆಗ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಂತಹ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವ ನೌಕರರು ಮಾರಮೇಲ್ಪಾಡು ಸೇರು ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಂಥವಸವೆಯೇ ಒಂದು ಅವಾದನಮಾಡಿ ಚೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಿರುತ್ತದೆ ತೊಂದರೆಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ protected clause, 34th clause ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೃತಾಕಲು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲ್ದೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಿ ದನಗಳು ಇವೆಯೇ ಒಂದು ಕ್ರೇಸ್ಟುವದಕ್ಕೆ

ಮನೆಯೋಗಿ ಅರಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೋಗಿ ಹೆಸ್ಟ್‌ಮುಕ್ತ ಮತ್ತು molestation ಮಾಡುವುದು? ಇಂಥಾದ್ದು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. Suppose you molest a girl, what happens? I am putting it bluntly and seriously. This thing is happening everywhere.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಕೊಂಡಿ. Decent ಆಗಿ ಕೊಂಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಮುಕ್ತಾಳಿಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಕೃಷ್ಣನರ್ ಪ್ರೌಷಿಚರ್ ಕೊಂಡನಲ್ಲಿ molestation ಪಡ ಹೇಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ? Is it indecent. ಆ ಮನುವೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಅಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊದಲು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಸ್ತಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಲು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯಿಬ್ಬಿದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದುದು ನನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಆ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪಡ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ not dignified? ಆ ತದನುಸಿರಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಜಡ್ಡಪೆಂಬ ನನ್ನ molestation out ranging the modesty of a women ಪಡಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ? ಆ molestation ಎಂಬ ಪಡ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮ ಏನಾದರೂ ಅವಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಪಡ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮನುವೆ ನಂಬಿಂಧ ಪಡದೇ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಕಾಡಣಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನಿರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

Shri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker cannot say this. How is it irrelevant?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order. He cannot question like this. ನಭಿಯ ಘನತೆ ಗಾಂಧಿಯರು ಮಾರಾಠಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Shri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I can question. How do you say that it is a wrong word, what are the provisions under which you say so. What are your powers? If I am wrong please tell me how I am wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He should not behave like this. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸರಪ್ಪು ನಭಿಯಮುಂದೆ ಚೆರೆಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಬಿರು ಸಂಭಾದವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನಿಕಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿ ಪಡಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ molestation, ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗೆ ನಭಿಯ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವ ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು. ಅದು ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಇಂದ್ರಾಧರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಳ್ವಿಕಣಿತವುದು ಮತ್ತು ದೋಷಾರೋಧಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ಏರೋಧಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ನಭಿಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಥಿಕ್ಕಬರಿತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇಂಥಾಧ್ಯಕ್ತ ತಕ್ಕುಕ್ರಮ ಕೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ತಾಳಿಪ್ಪ.—Molestation ಪಡ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದರೆ ಅಬರಳ್ಳಿ dignity ಇಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತರಕಗಳನ್ನೇಲ್ಲಾ ತಗೆದುಕೊಂಡುಹೋಗಿ ಕಾಮದಳಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೇಗೆ ವಾದಮಾಡುವಾರದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ತಾಳಿಪ್ಪ.—ಒಂದು ಮಾತನಾಡು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಪ್ರೌಲೈನ್ ಅರಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರ್ವಫಾ ಒಳ್ಳಯದಲ್ಲ. Protection of officers taking action under this Act. ಎಂದು ಏನು ಇಬ್ಬೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾಲಂಕಾಂತವಾಗಿ ಏಮರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ನೈತಿಕಬೇಕು. ಅರಿಕಾರಣಿಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪುದೂರ. ಅರಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಏನು ಸರಿಜಾವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

(ಕ್ರಿ. ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕುಂಡಪ್ಪ)

ಖಾಸಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವಾಂತರವಾಗಿ ರೈತರಮೀರೆ ದುಷ್ಪರಿಣಾಮವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಂಬು ಅಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

"No person shall be entitled to any compensation in respect of the destruction of any animal or thing or of any other loss, injury, detriment or inconvenience caused to him by reason of anything done under this Act in good faith".

ಈ ಶ್ಲೋಹಿಜನ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರಕಾರ ಕಾಂಪೇನೋಫೇಂಚನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾಕೆಂದರೆ ಪಾರ್ಶ್ವನಂಪತ್ತು ನಾಾಂವಾಡಿದರೆ ಪರಿಹಾರಕೊಂಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಪಾರ್ಶ್ವನಂಪತ್ತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಕ್ಕಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿತ್ತೇರಿ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ dual policy ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಪಾರ್ಶ್ವನಂಪತ್ತು ಗೋನಂಪತ್ತು, ಬೆಳೆಸ ದೇಶದ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ನುಧಾರಣೆ ವಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಅತಂಕಾಗು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಕಾನೂನು ಅದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾಹತವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕೊನೆಯುದಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ವಾತಾ ಹೇಳಿತ್ತೇನೆ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂತು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಡುವಾರದು ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಧಾನ ನಿರೂಪಣೆ ದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿಯ ಹೇಳುವ ನಿವಾರಣೆವಾದಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನುವಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅತಿ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪಾರ್ಶ್ವನೆ ವಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir my friends have covered most of the points. I wish to submit a few things for the consideration of the House. For any law to be successful, it must not only be a good law but the other party which has to obey the law should be well-educated, must be conscious of their rights and liabilities. We see the spectacle of so many legislations coming to utter disaster because there is no mutuality between the law of the State and the people. This law is certainly a good piece of legislation. It is long overdue. But then the people may not be conscious of their responsibilities. They are to be educated. I agree with the suggestions put forward by my hon'ble friends that in the initial stages, any law which has some rigorous provisions, must be leniently enforced to a certain extent because the people on whom responsibilities have been cast under the provisions of the law may not be conscious of their duties and liabilities for a certain period. This is one of the points which the Government will have to bear in mind before the rigorous provisions of the law are enforced. But then the Government has also certain responsibility in the matter before the people can be expected to follow the provisions. Before the Veterinary Department can come up to the standard, we must have very good hospital buildings, adequate medicine in the hospitals and, more than all these things, qualified personnel to man the hospitals. It is then and then only that the people who are to benefit from these things will have confidence in Government. Now, let us see whether we have got these things in our State. It is true that we have progressed fairly enough; I do not say that we are not progressing at all. In many cases, we have got our own buildings. Some of the hospitals are housed in rented buildings and in rooms. I do not know what exactly is the

percentage of hospitals which have no buildings at all. I personally pursued this matter to a certain extent. What I found was that if the buildings are to be put up, the people come forward with their contribution. The Department is not responsible for the construction of buildings at all. I do not know how a hospital can be run without a building. In many backward areas, there are no hospital buildings at all. The people have come forward and requested the Government to put up the buildings, but the buildings cannot be put up under the rules by the Government unless the people come forward with their contribution. So, they have no hospital buildings at all. What is the remedy for this? In certain areas where there are enlightened and rich people, the buildings are forthcoming but where there are no enlightened and rich people and where the areas are backward, buildings are not forthcoming at all. Of course, now things are better with regard to medicine. It is not so bad as it was before but it has not come up to the standard still. I know that in many cases we have no qualified Veterinary Surgeons. More than that, there are no Stock Men and Compounders. I am one of those who have been bawling aloud that in this State the condition of the personnel is not what it ought to be. Their pay scale in spite of the revision has not come up to the standard of that prevailing in the neighbouring States. That is the standing complaint. The pay scale of Veterinary Officers in Madras, Andhra, U. P. and in almost all over India is much better. The Hon'ble Minister for Veterinary Department must have tried his level best but he has not been able to bring the pay scale of these officers to the level which is prevailing in the neighbouring States. I know that several students have left the Veterinary College which was started last year and joined the Medical College. So, in spite of our having a College and in spite of all the propaganda have carried on in this behalf, we have not been able to encourage our youths to join this college. So, the chronic difficulty of dearth of personnel still prevails because the conditions of service of the veterinary personnel are not what they ought to be.

I want to say one thing with regard to the Stock Men. Most of our dispensaries are staffed with Stockmen. I do not know why the selection of Stockmen is given to the Public Service Commission. I agree that the conditions of service, weightage and other things should be there. I know that last year the P.S.C. took an inordinate time to advertise and select the students. Cannot the Government entrust this matter to some other authority as it has been done in the case of selection of students to the Medical and Engineering Colleges? The selection must be done quickly. Why should the P. S. C. come in the way of selection of people for being trained as Stockmen? When hundreds of our dispensaries are without Stockmen or Compounders—I do not understand. Even in such petty matters the Government have not yet awoken to their responsibilities by taking away these powers from the P. S. C. and entrusting them to some other authority in order to quicken

(Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

the selection of Stockmen. These are the matters which ought to be attended to before we can say that we are trying to improve the veterinary service or our cattle wealth.

Now, I fully agree that this piece of legislation is necessary. But there are certain harsh provisions which my friends have pointed out which need some looking into. I, as a lawyer, am not going into all the provisions in order to point out minor defects here and there but one or two difficulties which I thought ought to be looked into.

Now, clause 28 is there in practically every legislation and it ought to be there because there are good and bad officers. So, some provision must be made for the sake of these bad officers. But I do not understand sub-clause (2) which says that 'No prosecution under this section shall be instituted after the expiry of three months from the date on which the offence has been committed'. I should like the House to read this sub-clause along with sub-clause (2) of clause 34. They seem to be conflicting. It is also said that no prosecution can be launched without the consent of Government. How does the Government reconcile all these things? For every prosecution, the Government must sanction; for the sanction to be obtained, the party must move the Government and under sub-clause (2) of clause 28 no prosecution lies after the expiry of three months. Suppose I am an aggrieved party and I move the Government for sanction and Government takes 6 months to give sanction, under sub-clause (2) of clause 28, no prosecution lies. How am I to reconcile these matters? The whole thing seems to be confusing.

3-30 P. M.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Hon'ble Member must be aware that such a provision exists in the Bombay Act and it is working very well.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have not stated that it is not found anywhere else.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is actually in force in the Bombay Karnatak area.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have not read the Bombay Act. If no sanction of the Government is necessary to prosecute an officer. I can understand that. Is sanction necessary and if the Government has to be moved, how can that be done within three months? It is not possible. If it is a question of mere trespass, I can understand that action can be taken under the I. P. C. Therefore, I think sub-clause 2 will stand in the way and it is not at all practicable. If the Hon'ble Minister can assure us that no sanction is necessary and within three times prosecution has to be instituted. I can understand that.

I have objection with regard to sub-clause (2) of clause 34. If any act has been done by a Government servant in good faith. I do not think there is any offence at all. If in the due discharge of his duties an officer commits an act, it is not an offence at all. In no case can a private party get sanction of Government to prosecute such an officer. So, this sub-clause is absolutely not necessary.

One word with regard to clause 30. In actual practice I think this clause would work as a hardship. While framing law we must also think of extreme cases because we must make provision for every contingency. After all, why should police officers intervene here. We have given power to the Veterinary officer and he can go and get a bailable warrant. Supposing a vindictive officer wants to harass a person, he can go to a police officer and obtain warrant of arrest. We must visualise such things and we must make provisions for such things. So, clause 30 is not necessary and it may lead to enormous difficulties in later stages.

With these words I agree with the general provisions of the Bill.

†Sri N. RACHAIAH (Minister for Agriculture).—Sir, I am very thankful to the Hon'ble Members for having supported this simple and important Bill. Some doubts have been expressed with regard to certain provisions incorporated in this Bill. This is a Bill to bring about uniform legislation. The Government, by experience, have been convinced that the provisions contained in this Bill are necessary. No difficulty has been experienced by the farmers in any part of the State while implementing similar provision contained in the existing Acts.

The Leader of the Opposition expressed a doubt for having incorporated the word "may" in clause 5.

"The State Government may for the purpose of preventing the outbreak or spread of any contagious or infectious disease in or from any area, by notification."

This word already exists in the present Act. The Hon'ble Member expressed that the Government have inherent power to notify in such cases and so the word "may" need not be included. The provisions contained in clauses 28 and 29 have already been existing in the existing Acts and the Government have not heard of any difficulty being experienced by the farmers. These are provisions about which the Hon'ble Members have expressed great apprehension, and have expressed that it is not desirable to incorporate these clauses. Actually, these provisions are already found in the Bombay and Coorg Acts and they have been welcomed by the people. Unless we make a provision as in clause 29, I do not think the officers will be alert and will implement the Act impartially. There must be a sense of responsibility in the minds of officers implementing this Act. As such

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

there will be no difficulty at all. So, there should be no cause for any apprehension in the minds of the Hon'ble Members.

Regarding the powers of police officer:

"Any Police Officer not below the rank of a Sub-Inspector may, at the request in writing of a Veterinary Officer, arrest without warrant any person who has been concerned in any offence under this Act."

After all the police officer is going to take cognisance of the offence on the written complaint of the Veterinary Officer. So, there need not be any apprehension.

The Veterinary Officer will examine the case with due care and responsibility and it is only when he is convinced that the person is going to violate this provision that he will actually place before the police officer in writing.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—If a person fails to make a report the Veterinary Officer can ask him to be arrested without warrant. It looks very very vigorous.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—We cannot object to such provisions. When it is given in writing, it is the responsibility of the Veterinary Officer and if he misuses the powers under this Act, he will be liable to be prosecuted.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—After sanction by Government.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—In the case of any Government Officer, sanction of Government is necessary and here also I think it is necessary. Nobody can file a case against a Government Officer while he is discharging duties of Government sincerely and impartially. It is only a safety clause and there need not be any apprehension at all.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Even this is contrary to Criminal Procedure Code which prescribes that a Police Officer can only arrest any person who commits a cognizable offence. So, this conflicts with the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code. I do not think it is sustainable.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—It is already obtaining in the Coorg Act.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—But nobody has challenged in a court so far.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—If there is any such difficulty, the Government will not hesitate to move amendments. There is no complaint or representation to Government that this clause is actually harassing the farmers and those promoting cattle wealth. Even the Law Department have fully examined the provisions and these are already in force and they are being implemented without any difficulty.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Hon'ble Minister give us information as to how many have been arrested under this Section in Coorg?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—The Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition knows that there is Untouchability Act which provides for cognizable offences. How many people have been arrested by the Police Officer so far ? The provisions are there but while implementing these provisions the officers will be humane in their actions and there would not be any difficulty at all. The Government are perfectly convinced about it.

The Leader of the Opposition also pointed out that the farmers will be actually fined up to Rs. 100 in every case. That is not so. The discretion is given to the Magistrate or court to fine up to only Rs. 100. It may be one rupee or two or ten rupees. We are not mentioning any specific amounts, as such and it is left to the discretion of the courts, and generally courts also will be very reasonable.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What about Section 31 ?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—If he gives in writing, the court will take cognizance. It is provided in the Act itself. There is no difficulty or apprehension with regard to this. It is also provided in some other Act. Sri Narasimhan and Sri Muckannappa attacked the Government by saying that the Government are bringing forth this Bill to see that the farmers who are promoting or rearing livestock should be punished. That is not the object. In fact, Sir, if a person who has got profit motive were to bring a diseased animal and if that animal comes into contact with hundreds of costly cows sheep and other good animals, for no fault of his, the farmer will have to incur heavy damages. Sometimes it is ruinous for the farmer for the negligence of another person who has got profit motive. The very principle of this Bill is to protect the interests of the farmer. In these days, people are tuking more and more to non-vegetarian diet and so we will have to protect them. Not only will this cause loss to the farmer, but it may also affect the very life of persons who eat the flesh and meat of these animals. Even from that point of view, we have to incorporate these provisions and I do not think there is any difficulty or apprehension in the minds of the farmers. While implementing this newly passed Act, the Government will assure the Hon'ble Member that if there is any slightest difficulty that may be experienced by the farmers, the Government will move an amendments even during the next session. I will assure the Members so much. With regard to the promotion and development of Animal Husbandry Department, certain remarks have been passed by the Hon'ble Members like Sri Muckannappa and Sri Srinivasa Shetty ; they were opposing this Bill on the plea that there is no trained personnel and there are no buildings and medicine ; unless and until we have got good animals and livestock wealth what is the use of having veterinary doctors and surgeons ? What way do the buildings help us ? There must be an Act and we must have a good wealth of livestock. Then only, all these things will be provided. The Mysore State has never lagged behind and even today it has never lagged behind. The Officers have done their best and the Government are very much interested in developing the Animal Husbandry Department. We have

(Sri N. RACHAIAH)

also been given topmost priority with regard to the development of animal husbandry, particularly development of poultry, sheep breeding, dairying and all that. So, the charges levelled by the members against Government are baseless. I do not agree with those charges. In fact, they must appreciate the efforts of the Government in this field because our State is second to none with regard to the development of Animal Husbandry and providing veterinary services to the farmers and also people of the State. Even with regard to service conditions, if the Hon'ble Members were to see the orders that have been passed with regard to new pay scales, they will find that the Government have considered it with great sympathy. The pay scales of these officers have been very low. Now we have raised from Rs. 75 to Rs. 175 in the case of Veterinary Inspectors. Of course, Sri Srinivasa Shetty was telling me just now that South Kanara was very backward and Hyderabad Karnatak was very backward. How do you answer that? That situation is not obtaining in other States. There was no question of integration. There were no such problems of integration in other States and they were able to improve the conditions. That does not mean that the Government will keep quiet. We will certainly consider such claims in the interest of the development of these Departments and we do consider their claims at the appropriate time. Anyway, taking into consideration the State's resources, we have done our best to do justice even in the case of claims of officers pertaining to the Veterinary Services and also Animal Husbandry Department.

Sir, with these few remarks, I am sure that the Hon'ble Members have been convinced about the importance of this Bill and I repeat, if there is any harassment or difficulty or wounding of the feelings of the farmers, Government would assure that they would take immediate steps to amend the provisions which would go against the interest of the farmers in developing the livestock in the State.

Even with regard to the dairy, unless and until we give protection to good animals by segregating and preventing diseased animals, contagious disease and infectious disease, we will not be doing justice. All the provisions have been incorporated in the Bill keeping in mind the best interests of the farmers and also those people who are interested in promoting animal husbandry and dairying.

Sir, I commend the Bill for the kind consideration of the House.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—**The question is:

“That the Mysore Animal diseases (Control) Bill, 1959 as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration.”

*The motion was adopted*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now the Bill will be submitted clause by clause: Clauses 2 to 27

The question is:

“That Clauses 2 to 27, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopted*

Clauses 2 to 27 both inclusive were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 28. There is an amendment by Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I beg to move:

“That in Clause 28, sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in Clause 28, sub-clause (2) shall be deleted.”

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, as I have already said, it is not with any motive to oppose the Bill, I am saying this. I do not know, with all the arguments we have put forth on this side, the Hon'ble Minister goes on saying that this provision is found in Coorg and in Bombay. Beyond this, he has not been pleased to say whether any sanction is necessary under clause 28 for prosecuting an officer who has misbehaved. My only submission is that if a sanction is necessary, the whole clause is rendered nugatory. If the Government can assure us that no sanction is necessary to launch a prosecution under clause 28, then we have no objection to retain the present clause as it is, because if clause 2 is there and if sanction has to be taken, it serves no purpose. It is our experience that it takes many months—three months or six months for any private party to get sanction to prosecute an officer. But on the other hand, if Government says that no sanction is necessary because it is an independent offence,...it will be an offence under the IPC—if a person trespasses into a private house and assaults a private party, it is not an offence under this Bill. Then sanction may not be necessary. But it is a doubtful matter. If the Law Department can assure the House that no sanction is necessary and let a private party file a complaint within three months and take his redress in the court. If he fails to complain within three months limit, he will have to suffer for it. But if sanction is necessary then the sub-clause will have to be deleted.

†Sri G. VENKATA GOWDA.—Sir, apart from the reasons quoted by my hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Shetty just now which in my view are very valid, I beg to submit another reason which goes to show that the sub-section (2) would not be sustainable. Clause 28 contemplates the prosecution of officers—penalty for vexatious entry. Supposing an officer commits such an act and complains to the Sub-Inspector of Police or magistrate to take cognisance of the offence, there will be a trial

(Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

against the person who is said to have committed that offence. Supposing, the trial takes six months and at the end of it, the Magistrate holds that the entry is vexatious and not warranted, thereafterwards, that person against whom the complaint was made in the court could not proceed with the prosecution for the simple reason that the time mentioned in sub-clause (2) would have lapsed. Therefore, I submit that any prosecution under this clause cannot be launched at all in such cases. From that point of view, sub-clause (2) deserves to be deleted. This is apart from the reason which my friend Mr. Shetty submitted which is very valid. Therefore my submission is that this sub-clause would not be sustainable under 28 or under 34.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—With reference to the point raised by my friend Sri Venkatai Gowda. I do not see whether any judicial decision is called for in order to lodge a complaint against the officer under clause 28. In that case, he need not wait for the finding of the Magistrate at all.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What I am saying is, supposing a man against whom a complaint is made, keeps quiet till the trial is over and supposing the trial goes on for one year, after that trial will that man have time to launch a prosecution? In such cases, the persons aggrieved have no chance to go before the court for prosecution. From that point of view also, this sub-clause is liable to be deleted.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Sir, the Hon'ble Member Sri Setty expresses that this is going to harm the interest of the farmers...

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not a question of farmers' interests being harmed.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I know, it is in regard to the prosecution of the officer. Even here Sir, I think the Hon'ble Members have accepted clause 28(1). When we have accepted that clause, I think there must be some opportunity for the Government whether such a complaint is actually genuine or not. Then only it will be allowed. Even from that point of view, this sub-clause (2) is quite necessary. There is no reason for the Hon'ble Members to entertain any sort of doubts in regard to its working in practice.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Supposing at the Governmental level, there is a delay of more than three months?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—When we have provided a time limit in the Bill, I am sure you can expect the Government to act quickly.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA—Then it would be all right if you say here : 'three months exclusive of the time taken by the Government'. If you say that, it will be all right.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—I assure you once again that if there is any difficulty in the working, we are going to move an amendment even in this case. There is no difficulty whatsoever.

4-00 P. M.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I press the amendment, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That sub-clause (2) to Clause 28 shall be deleted”.

*The amendment was negatived*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That Clauses 28 to 33, both inclusive stand part of the Bill.”

*The motion was adopted*

Clauses 28 to 33, both inclusive were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to Clause 34.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I move

“That sub-clause (2) to Clause 34 shall be deleted.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That sub-clause (2) to clause 34 be deleted.”

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I have already given my reasons why this clause should not remain here. No Government officer is liable to be punished if the officer has done an act in good faith in the discharge of his functions. But no officer will agree or admit that he has done anything in bad faith. In such cases, Government will not hear the party, but bear only their officers. Government will not hold an enquiry in these matters. Whether an act is done in good or bad faith, it is for the Court to findout. Therefore, this clause is unnecessary and detrimental to the implementation of this Bill.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Apart from the reasons given by my friend, I wish to say that if the prosecution sought to be launched is vexatious, under clause 34, Government need not sanction. I do not understand why this provision should be there. I do not understand how the Government feels that the party seeking permission to prosecute an officer is not really grieved and refuses permission. Therefore I fail to understand the retention of sub-clause (2). It should be deleted. It is strange to have such a clause which restricts the fundamental rights of a person. If some person is aggrieved, why should he seek the permission of the Government to prosecute an officer? The Court is there to dismiss the complaint if it is vexatious. Why should the private party be restricted if he wants to prosecute an officer when he feels that something has been done by him in bad faith? This is a clause which I do not think will sustain in law. However clause 34 is there. In view of this, sub-clause (2) is unnecessary.

†Sri J. B. MALLARAPHYA.—Is it the view of the Government that section 28 refers to criminal proceedings and section 34 includes both civil and criminal proceedings? Under section 28, you wish to proceed against a party who has vexatiously committed an act. But in sub-clause

(Sri J. B. MALLRADHYA)

(2) of 34, you say that "no officer or servant of State Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceedings." Is it the intention of the Government to make a separate provision for civil proceedings? Supposing a party claims damages for acts done beyond the jurisdiction of the officer? I want to ask for clarification.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—To the extent there may be loss, you have to fix up the responsibility. All these questions will be examined by the Government.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—What is the Government going to examine? Are they going to bring an amendment?

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—So long as an officer acts in good faith and discharges his duties as per law, how can he be allowed to be prosecuted?

Sri C. K. RAJAH SHETTY.—The intention of the Government is to simply copy what is provided in the old Acts.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum-I).—I just want some explanation from the Government so far as these two clauses are concerned. The first clause of section 34 says that no prosecution shall be made "or other proceedings" without the previous sanction of the Government. May I know whether "proceedings" also include civil liability? Or, to what does it refer? The words "no prosecution or other proceedings" are rather vague. "Proceedings" mean what? Even if a man puts up an application to Government to sanction prosecution will amount to a "proceeding". By these words "other proceedings" I should like to know what is the intention of the Government to convey. It is not clear. What is the real intention behind all this? Then about sub-clause (2), when sub-clause (1) is there, I think sub-clause (2) is quite unessential. It is no use saying that Government will examine these clauses subsequently and then bring about an amendment. That is not proper procedure or the way in which we have to consider legislation. We have examined every word, every phrase and every clause before we give our sanction or approval for passing of any Acts. After the passing of the Act, to say that amendments will be brought, it is cumbrous. It is really an absurd thing, if I may say so. Before rushing through legislation, I should like to request the Government to examine every clause carefully and it for being passed before this House. It is no use saying that we will examine it subsequently. These two clauses appear to be rather strange. Without Government sanction, nobody can be prosecuted. Sub-clause (2) is practically of the same thing. "No officer...of Government shall be liable in respect of any such act in any civil or criminal proceeding..." After all, it is a Court which has to decide whether any damage is done by an officer. In the second clause also, it is for the Court either criminal or civil which has to decide in these matters. While drafting this clause, there has been some confusion in

the minds of the persons who have drafted. I should like the Government to study carefully and then bring legislation before us and not to rush as it is.

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—There is no difficulty at all about the incorporation of this provision. As such, Hon'ble Members need not entertain any doubt at all. We examined it thoroughly before we incorporated it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That sub-clause (2) of Clause 34 shall be deleted".

*The amendment was negatived*

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 34 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

Clause 34 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 35. There is an amendment. But it is out of order. The Hon'ble Members can speak on the clause, but he cannot move the amendment.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I wish to say one or two words, having tabled the amendment under clause 35. Naturally some limitation is necessary. This clause 35 says that all actions, criminal or civil, must be brought within six months. Where is the guarantee that the Government will give sanction within six months? There is no duty cast on the Government to give sanction within a fixed period? I can understand the provision if there is some duty cast, some liability cast on the part of the Government to give sanction within 2, 3, 5 months. Suppose they don't give sanction within a particular period; the whole thing becomes derogatory. I can understand if you say that after the sanction is given, the party must file his action within a certain period. Unless there is duty cast on the Government also to give sanction within a certain period, the other limitation is useless. Give him the number of days or months, but the limitation must begin to run from the date of sanction. Hence I oppose the clause.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I hope with regard to this particular clause, the Minister will not put forward the excuse that it is already in the existing bill and that it is in operation. You fix a date of limitation and that date of limitation should run after a particular date, after the sanction is given. We would not be a party to this. Let the Minister take time and examine and see whether what we are saying is reasonable. We say that these two or three provisions have no right to be there on the Statute Book. I would like the Minister to re-examine this particular provision. Of course, the other two provisions are passed. Let him not raise the bogey of its being already in the Bill and its being in operation.

† Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—This is a question of curtailment of the right that the persons have under ordinary law to get their grievances redressed. Here it is said that no suit shall be instituted against the State Government. If the Government contemplates under clause 34 that even for filing a suit against the Government, Government sanction is necessary, the retention of clause 35 is ridiculous because to proceed against the Government by way of a suit, I do not think the Government will give any sanction at all. How can the Government give sanction to a private individual to proceed against itself. Under clause 34, no prosecution or other proceedings shall be against any officer... In 'other proceedings' institution of a suit also could be included. If we put such an interpretation, even to proceed by way of a suit against the Government, sanction is necessary. Would the Government give sanction for a person to proceed against itself by way of filing a suit? I do not think that is possible. Therefore, the whole clause appears to be absurd and it is to be deleted.

† Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Government will not agree with such presumptions. Even in the Sales Tax Act of 1957 we have provided this very provision. With regard to the responsibility of the officers and even the public, the same principle will be applied. So I do not agree with these arguments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 35 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

Clause 35 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clauses 36 to 38, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

Clauses 36 to 38, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 1, the short Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted*

Clause 1, the short Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

*Motion to Pass*

Sri N. RACHAIAH.—Sir, I move :

"That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.**—The question is :

"That the Mysore Animal Diseases (Control) Bill, 1959, be passed by the Legislative Council, be passed."

*The motion was adopted*

**PONNAMPET NOTIFIED AREA COMMITTEE (CONTINUANCE AND VALIDATION) BILL, 1959, AS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

*Motion to consider*

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Local-Self—Government).—Sir, I move :

"That the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee (Continuance and Validation) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.**—Motion moved :

"That the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee (Continuance and Validation) Bill, 1959, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

† Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—It is a very simple Bill. The term of the Ponnampet Notified Area Committee expired on the 28th July 1958. Then elections were ordered to be held in the month of June 1958 and calendar was issued. Because the returning officer did not scrutinise the various nomination papers he simply adjourned it. It was examined and elections were completed after appointing a fresh returning officer. A higher officer was appointed and the elections were completed before 30th of September 1958. For two months and 4 days, the Council and the President continued in office, even without an extension order being passed by the Government. According to the Coorg Municipality Act, Government has no power to extend the term of office of any Municipality. The matter was brought to the notice of the Government just at the time when 2 months and 4 days were over. Then we did not want to pass any ordinance. Therefore, this Bill is brought to validate all the acts done by the President and the Council for 2 months and 4 days. We did not want to issue any ordinance; there was no hurry about it because they were already in office under the order of the Deputy Commissioner. We brought a Bill and got it ratified by the Legislative Council. Therefore, there is no lapse on the part of the Government. The Council never met and no meeting was held. Though they were in office, they carried on only the day to day administration. In order to